

**CITY OF MORGAN HILL
JOINT SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL
AND SPECIAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
MINUTES – JUNE 24, 2003**

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Kennedy and Chairman Azevedo called the special meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL ATTENDANCE

City Council

Present: Mayor Kennedy, Mayor Pro Tem Chang, Council Members Carr, Sellers, Tate.

Planning Commission

Present: Commissioners Acevedo, Mueller, Engles, Escobar, Lyle, Weston.

DECLARATION OF POSTING OF AGENDA

The meeting's agenda is certified to have been duly noticed and posted in accordance with Government Code 54954.2.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mayor Kennedy opened the floor to comment for items not appearing on this evening's agenda.

No comments being offered, public comment was closed.

City Council Action and Planning Commission Action

WORKSHOP:

1. JOINT WORKSHOP REGARDING THE MURPHY AVENUE CORRIDOR STUDY

Mayor Kennedy announced the procedures for the meeting: Staff presentation, joint discussion, and hearing from members of the public.

Mayor Kennedy announced the procedures for the meeting: Staff presentation, joint discussion, and hearing from members of the public.

Community Development Director (CDD) Bischoff presented the staff report and introduced Ken Schreiber, Contract Planner, and Sue DeBorde of Fehr & Peers, traffic consultants contracted by the City to conduct the Murphy Avenue Corridor Study, which was the focus of this meeting. CDD Bischoff gave a brief overview of the purpose of the Study: 1) to fulfill the requirements of the General Plan; 2) determine alternative ways to serve the land uses in the Murphy Avenue corridor; 3) identify circulation issues, problems and benefits for roadway alternatives; and 4) provide data that can be used in the environmental assessment of any resulting General Plan changes.

When the General Plan was being considered for adoption in 2001, CDD Bischoff said, neighbors voiced concern about Murphy Avenue being designated an arterial street; however, this had been the case since 1990. The City Council in March, 2003 authorized a feasibility study for evaluating use of the corridor and possible alternatives for routing traffic through the area. The City contracted with traffic consulting firm and the report presented tonight resulted.

CDD Bischoff continued by saying that the information presented at this meeting is not an alignment precise plan, but a series of alternatives to be presented. Once an alternative is selected, CDD Bischoff said, after hearings by both the Planning Commission and the City Council with public input – a precise alignment will need to be formulated.

Those property owners living within 300-feet of an area which the City proposes to change or those who will be directly affected, such as having land taken, etc. will be mailed notices of public hearings at the Planning Commission and/or City Council. Discussion ensued as to when those public hearings might be held. General consensus of those Planning Commission and City Council members present was that no hearings should take place until September, 2003 at the very earliest.

Councilmember Sellers asked when actual construction of the undeveloped areas would be. CDD Bischoff responded that, even though specific development plans for projects have been submitted to the City, for example, the Ford Store, the Aquatic Center, a miniature golf installation, etc., development as a whole probably would not occur for years, and certainly not in the next 5 – 10 years.

Mayor Kennedy referenced a Traffic Calming Study the City has undertaken. Director of Public Works (DPW) Ashcraft said that study is nearing completion. He reminded that the Traffic Calming Study is not specific to Murphy Avenue. Three areas/neighborhoods of the City have requested the study, DPW Ashcraft said. Mayor Kennedy said his preference would be to have Murphy Avenue evaluated for Traffic Calming emphasis.

Chair Acevedo asked if the plan is for completion of any widening or right-of-way acquisition all at once or in piecemeal fashion. CDD Bischoff responded that work would be done as development occurs.

Ms. DeBorde reminded that the purpose of the study is to fulfill the requirements of the General Plan, and look at alternatives (circulation issues). She gave an overview of the area studies and provided details of the three alternatives presented, including advantages and disadvantages of each. [Materials on file in the Morgan Hill Planning Department]

Commissioners and Council Members discussed the report, raising the following issues:

- Jog at Mission View [this would discourage through traffic]
- Continuation of St. Louise [yes]
- Need for minimal change to existing General Plan
- Guglielmo Property
- Mission Ranch development
- Kelley Park area
- Driveways ingressing/egressing Murphy

- Proposed lane increases for Murphy/Condit/Hill/Peet streets
- Possible street alignments/connections
- Economic development goals of the City
- Possible reduction of land use
- Traffic issues
 - Effects of Highway 101 – including through traffic and residential/commercial development to the south of the City
 - (potential) Coyote Valley development
 - Possibilities for development of a ‘Butterfield Boulevard’ on the east side of the City
 - Development of commercial and industrial areas in the City
 - Relying more on Hill/Peet to carry north/south traffic
- Fiscal costs of the study [\$92,000]
- Santa Teresa Boulevard relative to plans of Gilroy
- Intersections [which will require additional study and planning]

Possible/desirable outcomes were then discussed:

- Stay with existing general plan traffic section, which is long term but involves some costs; of special concern: intersections
- Look at Urban Limit Line study
- Consider the City’s sphere of influence
- Review the potential of industrial development in the City including full build out of the General Plan
- Connection of multiple streets while discouraging through traffic by using traffic calming
- Need for a ‘mirror’ of Butterfield Boulevard on the Eastside as development occurs
- Dialogue on formulating a plan for ‘triggering’ review of the General Plan based on increased development and resultant traffic
- Concern regarding future traffic using neighborhood streets
- Use of the Greenbelt Study in planning for traffic
- When implementation of traffic study will actually be needed
- Possibility of a business park development in the South of the City
- Need for reliable decision-making – something people can count on
- Upgrade/construction of an interchange at Middle Ave. for additional traffic access

Noting several members of the public present, Mayor Kennedy opened the public hearing.

Michael Lawson, 1385 James Ct., urged all decision makers to consider the safety issues, particularly where children are concerned, as well as giving thought to the traffic generated by users of the local parks. Mr. Lawson said he uses Butterfield Boulevard daily and would like to see a ‘mirror’ road on the Eastside. He indicated that there would be logic to having Condit be a four-lane road rather than Murphy, as there are several businesses located on Condit. Mr. Lawson urged all present to look at the ‘big picture’, noting that across from Kelly Park there is high-density development.

Mary Johnson, 17470 Murphy Ave., requested answers to specific questions/issues which were e-mailed to the Consultant and the Council members. Ms. Johnson referenced the alternatives presented, asking

the effects impact if Condit were made into four-lanes instead of Murphy. “How many homes and farms are in the way of having Murphy become four-lanes – and what will the fiscal impacts be?” she asked. “A major concern,” Ms. Johnson continued, “is that Condit is loaded up with businesses; why not keep traffic on Condit – that would help the businesses more.” She urged a look at the ‘big picture’, urging those present to keep the school in mind.

Nick Johnson, 17470 Murphy Ave, questioned the advisability of putting businesses on Condit, but leaving Condit as a two-lane street. Mr. Johnson used a comparison of a business-developed area in Los Gatos, stating that he believes alternatives are possible. “Murphy is all zoned for residential,” Mr. Johnson said, “why not keep traffic on Condit where there are businesses?”

Ben Porson, 830 G Middle Ave., referenced the consideration of having Highway 101 and Middle Ave. become an interchange providing access to the City. He said the area is now in the County, asking if there were plans for annexation. Mr. Porson also expressed concern that the cloverleaf interchange would be placed where two dwellings are now on his property. CDD Bischoff responded that would be a desirable location for entrance to the City, as it would benefit because of planned business development at Condit and is a long-term goal of the City. However, Middle Ave. is not in the City’s sphere of influence and because the City doesn’t ‘do’ interchanges, such action would require the cooperation of many, many agencies.

Aileen Poryson, 19270 Quinn Cr., explained the location of her home, saying that even though her property is not part of the suggested alternatives, she is worried about certain items, namely the impact of traffic to the new high school and how traffic matters could be enforced. Ms. Poryson asked if there were alternative streets planned for students and workers to get to the high school.

Nilou Tarani, 1581 Kelly Park Dr., urged all those making decisions regarding Murphy Ave. to proceed slowly. She said she agreed with the thoughts of the previous speakers regarding making Condit a four-lane road. Ms. Tarani strongly urged that Murphy be kept at two-lanes.

With no others indicating a wish to address the issue, the public hearing was closed.

Council members and Commissioners discussed with staff the issues that had been raised. It was observed that three letters had been received regarding the workshop issues. [Letters on file in the Morgan Hill Planning Department]

CDD Bischoff noted that Council members and Commissioners had made several requests for items to be more clearly identified or included or further studied during this workshop. He asked for direction for modification of the study before having public hearings. Requested items include impact of/potential for traffic calming, greater use of other routes including Hill/Peet and/or possible new boulevard, impact of the Aquatics Center, post 2025 traffic and potential industrial park southeast of 101 and Tennant Avenue.

Council members and Commissioners agreed modification of the study would be important in view of the discussions, but expressed concern of fiscal constraints. Need for completion of the Traffic Calming

study and the Urban Limit Line Study were noted. It was agreed that CDD Bischoff would review the issues and concerns raised at the workshop, and incorporate those in the materials - along with options possible – after the Urban Limit Line Study had reached agreement regarding the need for an additional industrial park in the Tennant Avenue area (December 2003 – January 2004).

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Mayor Kennedy adjourned the Special City Council meeting at 7:50 p.m.; and Chairman Azevado called a brief recess for the Planning Commission.

MINUTES RECORDED AND PREPARED BY:

JUDI M. JOHNSON